CMP-SPRCM-75-02

# SELECTIONS FROM PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA MAGAZINES

American Consulate General
Hong Kong, B. C. C.

January 15, 1975

U.I.C.C.
MAR 21 1975
LIBRARY

DISTRIBUTED BY:

NTIS

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023

https://archive.org/details/selections-from-prc-magazines_1975-01-15_2

CMP-SPRCM-75-02

# Selections from People's Republic of China Magazines

American Consulate General
Hong Kong, B.C.C.

No. 805
January 15, 1975

This edition is printed in the United States of America for dissemination in the Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Mediterranean, and the west coast of Africa from material produced by the American Consulate General, Hong Kong. All queries concerning this edition should be sent to:

National Technical Information
Service (152.12)
U.S. Department of Commerce
Springfield, Virginia 22151

---

## Refute the Fabricators of Lies

## - On several questions concerning the Sino-Soviet Border

by

Shih Yü-hsin

Li-shih Yen-chiu [Historical Research]

No. 1, December, 1974

PRICES SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
US Department of Commerce
Springfield, VA. 22151

# Refute the Fabricators of Lies

## - On several questions concerning the Sino-Soviet border

by

Shih Yü-hsin (史宇文)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu [Historical Research], No. 1, December, 1974)

In the past two years, under the instigation of the ringleaders of Soviet revisionism, responsible officials of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Chikhavinsky and Kapitsa, academician of the Academy of Sciences Norodintsky, academician of the Academy of Communications Sladkovsky, and others have written many newspaper articles and published many books on the history of the Sino-Soviet border issue.* Betraying the brilliant theses of Marx, Engels and Lenin with regard to the history of Sino-Soviet relations, they try their best to defend the crimes of Tsarist Russia in encroaching upon Chinese territory. They claim that the Heilung [Amur] and Wusuli River basins "never belonged" to China, and that they were land owned by nobody which had been "reclaimed" by Russians. They say that the "Treaty of Nipchu" [Nerchinsk] was an unequal treaty which China forced Tsarist Russia to sign. They describe the "Treaty of Aigun" and the "Treaty of Peking" which Tsarist Russia imposed upon China after the Opium War as equal treaties. They claim that the areas south and east of the Balkhash Lake annexed by Tsarist Russia "never belonged" to China. They even regard the vast expanse of Chinese territory in the Heilung and Wusuli River basins annexed by Tsarist Russia as territory "partially taken back" from the Ch'ing Dynasty which, they say, "seized the territory from Russia," thus creating public opinion for the new territorial demands which Soviet revisionism advanced to China. They also distort the truth about the current

---

Note: Some Russian names are transliterations.

* Besklovni, Chikhavinsky and Hovstov, "On the History of Formation of the Sino-Russian Border," carried in the 1972 issue No. 6 of "International Life" journal of the Soviet Union; Kapitsa, "Truth-Proving Documents," carried in the Soviet "Izvestia" of November 13, 1972; "Documents on Sino-Russian Relations During the 17th Century," Vol. 2, published in 1972, edited by Chikhavinsky; Norodintsky, Sladkovsky, and others, "Far Eastern International Relations," published in 1973; Besklovni, "On the Russian-Sino Relations During the 17th Century," carried in the 1974 issue No. 1 of the Soviet "Far East Problems" journal; Norodintsky, "On the History of Russian Foreign Policy in the Far East During the 19th Century," carried in the 1974 issue No. 6 of the Soviet "Historical Problems" journal; and so forth.

negotiations on the Sino-Soviet border issue, trying to shift to China the responsibility of failing to improve the relations between the two nations and to achieve results in the negotiations on the border issue, thus fanning up anti-China hysteria. We write this article with the purpose of replying to these lies and provocations of Soviet revisionism.

## I. The Heilung and Wusuli River Basins Have Been Chinese Territory Since Ancient Times

In their articles, the Soviet revisionists claim that the areas along the Heilung River and east of the Wusuli River are territory "reclaimed" by Russia in the middle of the 17th century; that before that, the areas "did not belong to the Chinese," that "neither did they belong to anyone," that "no Chinese had ever lived there," and that on official maps the vast expanse of territory north of the Liaotung Peninsula were "not defined as falling within the territory of the Ming and Ch'ing dynasties." This is sheer forgery of history.

Historical documents have substantiated that in the first half of the 8th century A.D., not to mention earlier periods, the Chinese government of the T'ang Dynasty already set up administrative organs to rule over the Shihwei and Moho tribes in the Heilung and Wusuli River areas. According to "The Former T'ang History," the T'ang royal court assigned the "Pinglu military governor to pacify the Shihwei and Moho tribes."* In areas inhabited by the Shihwei tribe, the T'ang government set up the Shihwei governor's office; while in areas inhabited by the Moho tribe, it set up the Huhan Chou governor's office and the Heishui Chou governor's office (Heishui means Heilungkiang). The Poli Chou under the administration of the Heishui governor's office was located at present-day Poli (Khabarovsk).

During the 10th century, the Chinese Liao Dynasty placed the Shihwei, Moho and other tribes under its rule and appointed a five-state governor in charge of the areas along the lower reaches of the Heilung River. During the 12th century, the Chin Dynasty separately set up the Puyu Lu, Hulikai Lu, and Hsupin Lu (Lu was the name of an administrative area at that time) in the Heilung River basin and east of the Wusuli River. During the 13th century, the Yuan Dynasty also set up the Kaiyuan Lu and the Shuitata Lu in the above-mentioned areas.

In the early 15th century, the Ming Dynasty set up the Nurkan Tuchihhuishih-Szu [command office] in the Heilung and Wuzuli basins to rule over the people of Mongol, Nuchen and Chilimi nationalities.

---

* "The Former T'ang History," Vol. 38.

The first responsible officials of the Nurkan Tuchihhuishih-Szu were Kang Wang and Wang Chao-chou. Troops were stationed at Tirin near the estuary of the Heilung River where the headquarters of the Nurkan Tuchihhuishih-Szu was located. There were more than 400 administrative organs called Suo and Wei under the Tuchihhuishih-Szu. The Wuti River Wei was set up near the Wuti River (the present Udi River in the Soviet Union). The Kuli River Wei was set up near the Kuli River along the upper reaches of the Chingchili River (today's Chiliuyi River in the Soviet Union). The Shuangcheng Wei was set up at Shuanchengtzu (today's Ussuriysk in the Soviet Union). The Kannan River Wei was set up near the Kannan River (today's Onon River). The Nanghaerh Wei was set up at Nanghaerh (today's Langkoli on Sakhalin Island in the Soviet Union). Etc. Officials were assigned to head each Wei and each Suo. They were given the official seals of the Ming government to enforce the laws of the Ming Dynasty, recruit soldiers, and collect taxes according to schedule. The Ming Dynasty's administration over the above-mentioned districts was recorded in a great number of documents. It is also proved by two stone tablets in Tirin, erected in 1413 and 1433, which record the establishment of the Nurkan Tuchihhuishih-Szu and the Ming Dynasty's administration over this area.

From the late 16th century to the thirties of the 17th century, Nuerhhachih, an official of the Chienchou Wei in the Ming Dynasty and chief of the Nuchen (Manchu) nationality, and the Hou Chin (renamed Ch'ing in 1636) regime took over the northeastern frontier of the Ming Dynasty. The people of Solun, Tahur, Olunchun and other nationalities living along the Argun and Chingchili Rivers, the people of Hoche nationality living along the middle and lower reaches of the Heilung River and in the Wusuli River basin, the people of Feiyako and Olunchun nationalities along the lower reaches of the Heilung River and along the coast, and the people of the Moumingan tribe of the Mongol nationality along Nipchu were incorporated into Hou Chin at one time and another. Some of them were directly organized into the eight banners of Manchuria, called "New Manchuria." Some of them were "divided into different groups of households each headed by a clan head or a village head,"* paying taxes to Hou Chin periodically.

All these facts prove beyond all doubt that about a thousand years before the first group of Russian "new-land discoverers" intruded into the Heilung River basin in the mid-17th century, that is, more than 100 years prior to the founding of Kiev Russia, this area had already been incorporated into Chinese territory, and that since then it has consistently been under the administration of governments of the various dynasties of China. No matter how skillful Soviet revisionism is in rewriting history, it can never obliterate this history of up to a thousand years.

---

* "A General Analysis of the Ch'ing Dynastic Documents," Vol. 271, Chapter 3, Geography Section.

Soviet revisionism has also endlessly prattled about the Willow Pale, claiming that it formed the then "northern boundary" of the Ch'ing Dynasty. This is pure nonsense. The Willow Pale was also called the "Shengching Fence."* The district outside the Willow Pale was also Chinese territory, being under the rule of the general of Ningkuta and the Inner Mongolia princes.** The purpose of Ch'ing Dynasty in setting up the Willow Pale in the Liao River basin was to protect the so-called "cradle" of the Ch'ing royal family and to prevent people outside of the Willow Pale from freely entering the Shengching area. Furthermore, forbidden areas were designated outside of the Willow Pale where members of the royal family hunted and gathered ginseng, pearls and other valuable things. Thus, the Ch'ing Dynasty forbade people living inside of the Willow Pale to freely go to places outside of the Pale so as to protect the interests of the royal family. The so-called "Willow Pale" was actually the boundary line of Shengching, Ningkuta and Inner Mongolia administrative districts. A county had its boundary line, just as a province also had its own boundary line. This is plain common sense. Calling a deer a horse, Soviet revisionism arbitrarily calls the Willow Pale a "state boundary." This only shows that in forging history it has exhausted its poor tricks.

Soviet revisionism also claims that the people of Manchu are not Chinese and that the Ch'ing Dynasty represented the rule of a foreign country over China. To defend Tsarist Russia's efforts in encroaching on China's territory, it even ignores basic common sense. Everybody knows that the Manchu nationality has always been a nationality in China. The forefathers of Manchu were called Sushen. They were called Ilou during the Han and Wei dynasties, Wuchi during the Northern and Southern dynasties, and Moho during the T'ang Dynasty. After the Liao Dynasty, they were called Nuchens and then Manchus during the Ch'ing Dynasty. The "Family Tree of the Manchu Eight Banners" of the "General History of the Eight Banners" lists 625 Manchu surnames. For generations they lived in the Heilungkiang, Wusuli, Sungari and Liao River basins. A total of 139 surnames of Manchu nationality were recorded among the people living in the northern and southern parts of Heilungkiang, accounting for one-fifth of the total number of surnames of the Manchu nationality. Many mountains and rivers in the Heilung and Wusuli River basins were given names in the Manchu dialect. Take the outer Hsingan Mountains for example. "Hsingan" is from the Manchu dialect, meaning an "extremely cold place." There is a famous Chichi Lake in the lower reaches of Heilung River. "Chinchi" is also from the Manchu dialect, meaning "sea cucumber." "Wusuli" is also from the

---

* "General History of the Ch'ing Dynasty," Vol. 39.

** "Factual Records of Ch'ienlung of the Ch'ing Dynasty," Vol. 243.

Manchu dialect, meaning "the King of Heaven." The Sikhote-Alin Mountains east of the Wusuli River and the Niman River were also given names from the Manchu dialect. "Sikhote" means "very few livestock," while "Alin" means "mountains," "Niman" means "goats." Marx pointed out in 1857: "It has been only a few years since it (meaning Russia) occupied places on both sides of the Heilung River--the hometown of the present ruling nationality in China." ("Russia's Trade with China") Marx's words most explicitly indicate that the Manchu nationality is one of the nationalities in China and that areas on both sides of the Heilung River are Chinese territory. China is a multinational country. In feudal society, sometimes the ruler of one nationality seized political power, sometimes the ruler of another nationality took political power. This kind of phenomenon is not unusual in other multinational countries throughout the world. How absurd it is to regard the Ch'ing Dynasty, established by the Manchu rulers, as rule of a foreign country over China! There were in fact true foreigners among the Russian Tsars. As Engels pointed out, Catherine II was a foreigner, too. ("Russian Tsarist Government's Foreign Policy") Pokrovsky, a Soviet historian of the earlier period wrote: "From the mid-18th century, Russia's rulers were descendants of the German Holstein dukes, although they claimed to belong to the Romanov family."* It would of course be ridiculous if someone, on the basis of this fact, claimed that the Romanov dynasty represented the rule of a foreign nation over Russia, not to mention the fact that the Manchu nationality is originally a Chinese national minority and not foreign at all.

## II. The "Treaty of Nipchu" [Nerchinsk] Confirmed in Legal Form the Eastern Sector of the Sino-Russian Border

Being a European country, Tsarist Russia did not originally border on China. During the eighties of the 16th century, Tsarist Russia crossed the Ural Mountains and quickly expanded toward the east. In the middle of the 17th century, Poykov, Habkov and other fully armed Tsarist Russian aggressors intruded into China's Heilungkiang basin and forcibly occupied such places as Nipchu and Yaksa while the main force of the Ch'ing troops was entering Shanhaikuan. They killed and burned; they held people as "hostages," "extorted all that they could extort"** and, according to the Cossack "habit," "divided among themselves" women they had captured. They even went so far as to inhumanly eat human flesh. "Sanguinary, all-destructive storms"*** swept every place. The beautiful and rich

---

* Pokrovsky, "Brief History of Russia," 1933 London edition, Vol. 1, p. 42.

** Kruzdovsky, "On the Sea Shore -- the Heilungkiang Region," 1914 Vladivostok edition, p. 62.

*** Lopakin, "Records of Nationalities in the Seaside Region," carried in "Nature and Economy of the Seaside Region," 1923 Vladivostok edition, Part 1, p. 143.

areas along the Heilung River became devastated. The "Discoverers of the New Land," as described by Soviet revisionism, were exactly like Spanish colonist Pizarro, who conquered the Inca empire of the American Indians in the 16th century and was notorious for his cruelty, greed, dishonesty and injustice. They were a gang of colonial bandits of matchless ferocity and cruelty. They were "typical Russian Pizarros."*

Confronted with Tsarist Russia's rabid aggression, the local Chinese people of various nationalities rose up to resist, and asked the government of the Ch'ing Dynasty to dispatch troops to expel the invaders. The Ch'ing army carried out two punitive campaigns, in 1652 and 1658, against the invading Cossack troops, and as a result the Russian aggressive forces in the Heilungkiang basin were wiped out at one time. Shortly afterward, rebellions broke out in southern China. Taking advantage of the reduced border defense forces in Northeast China due to the movement of the Ch'ing army to the south, Tsarist Russia once again invaded Yaksa, building a city there and occupying the place. After lodging repeated protests without avail, the Ch'ing government again sent its troops to expel the invaders in 1685 and at the same time expressed its hope to settle the boundary issue between the two countries through negotiations. In view of its unsuccessful military aggression, Tsarist Russia agreed to hold negotiations with China. The Russian government instructed its plenipotentiary, Golovin, to propose using the Heilung River or Niuman River (Beliya River) or Chingchili River (Jiya River) as the boundary line, and, if this demand could not be met, to propose taking Yaksa as the border. If the Ch'ing government still refused to accept the latter proposal, then the Russian troops could be withdrawn from Yaksa. In addition, the Tsarist Russian government told Golovin that, if necessary, its aggressive troops could be withdrawn from all of the Tahur region, including the Shilka River basin. Immediately upon learning that the Russian side agreed to hold talks, the Ch'ing government stopped the fighting unconditionally, took the initiative to withdraw to Aigun its troops which were besieging Yaksa, and appointed So-o-tu as its representative for the negotiations. In 1688 Emperor K'anghsi gave the following instruction to So-o-tu: "Nipchu, Yaksa, the upper and lower reaches of the Heilung River, as well as all its tributary streams and brooks belong to us. They must not in the least be given up to Russia."** But shortly afterward, a dispute occurred in northern China between Dzungaria and Ko-erh-ko Mongolia. To cope with this domestic incident, Emperor K'anghsi wanted to reach a compromise with Tsarist Russia as soon as possible in order to avoid collusion between the latter and the Dzungarian rebel chieftain Ko-erh-tan. For this reason, he again instructed So-o-tu: "If they ask for Nipchu, we may take the

---

* "Works of Paklosin," Vol. 3, Part 1, p. 154.

** "Factual Records of K'anghsi of the Ch'ing Dynasty," Vol. 135.

Argun River as the boundary line."* In August 1689, the plenipotentiaries of both countries held negotiations in Nipchu. On September 7, they formally signed the "Treaty of Nipchu," which clearly stipulated the line extending from the Outer Hsingan Mountains (Stanov Mountains) to the sea and the Galpizi and Argun Rivers as the eastern section of the Sino-Russian border. This treaty confirmed in legal form that the vast areas of the Heilung and Wusuli River basins were Chinese territories. The Russian side agreed to withdraw home its troops which had intruded into the Heilung River region, and the Ch'ing Dynasty consented to give up the Chinese land in the Nipchu area to Tsarist Russia, and agreed that no boundary line would be set up in the Wuti River region for the time being pending a separate agreement. Besides, the Ch'ing Dynasty granted trading rights to Russia. Summing up the above, the "Treaty of Nipchu" was a result of consultations between the two sides on an equal basis, with concessions made by the Chinese government. If it is said that this treaty resulted in territorial cession, it is China that ceded her land to Tsarist Russia, not the other way around.

The Soviet revisionists with an ulterior motive allege that the "Treaty of Nipchu" is a treaty that the Ch'ing Dynasty forced on Tsarist Russia, and that it is "a concrete manifestation of unequal relations." This is really an open lie, and consequently they are slapping their own face. As the "Collection of Documents on 17th Century Russian-Chinese Relations" edited by Chiharvinsky and published by the Soviet Union in 1972 states, Golovin, the Tsarist Russian plenipotentiary at the signing of the "Treaty of Nipchu," was "commended and promoted" by order of the Tsar for his meritorious service in concluding this treaty. If Golovin was an envoy who concluded and signed a humiliating treaty, how could he have been treated as a hero and given a lavish reward by the Tsar? For another example, the "Encyclopedia of the Soviet Union" published in 1954 states: "The Treaty of Nipchu is a major diplomatic victory for Russia." The "Dictionary of Diplomacy" edited by Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko and others and published in 1961 also stresses that the Nipchu Sino-Russian boundary negotiations were "official negotiations based on equality," that "the treaty consolidated and expanded the friendly relations between the peoples of two neighboring countries." To this, the following Russian proverb can be applied: "The black ink on the white paper cannot be erased even with an axe."

In order to deny the legal validity of the "Treaty of Nipchu," the Soviet revisionists have spared no efforts to stress that the treaty has texts in different languages which "are couched in different terms." They also assert that some clauses of the treaty were "beyond comprehension even at the time when it was concluded." The "Treaty of Nipchu" has three different texts. Of the three texts, only the Latin text was

---

* "Factual Records of K'anghsi of the Ch'ing Dynasty," Vol. 140.

signed by both sides as the official text, while the Manchu and Russian texts were not signed by both sides. Although slightly different wordings or clauses are found in the various texts, they all contain a crystal clear and completely identical principal clause to the effect that the Sino-Russian national boundary runs from the Outer Hsingan Mountains to the sea and through the Galpisi and Argun Rivers, and that all tributaries, large and small, which empty into the Heilung River belong to China. Another fact is that although the mountain range which was defined as the national boundary between the two countries has different names such as "Rock Mountains" and "Rocky Great Hsingan Mountain Ridge," all the texts of the treaty define it explicitly as the watershed between the rivers which empty into the Heilung River and the rivers north of the mountain range. For this reason, the mountain range mentioned here is in all cases the same, the one called the Outer Hsingan Mountains. The Soviet revisionists' insistence that the mountain range determining the boundary between the two countries is "not clearly defined in the treaty" is an entirely unreasonable argument not worthy of comment. However "ambiguous" the clauses of the "Treaty of Nipchu" are, one cannot mistake the mountains for the rivers and move the Sino-Russian boundary southward from the Outer Hsingan Mountains to the Heilung River.

The book "A Trip to the North" by Ho Chiu-t'ao contains the following sentence: "The several thousand square kilometers in the Northeast which were not part of China have been incorporated into its territory." Grasping this sentence, the Soviet revisionists arbitrarily regard it as something that derives from the report of the "military intelligence office" of the Ch'ing Dynasty to Emperor K'anghsi. They jubilantly declare that the Manchus acknowledged that through the "Treaty of Nipchu," they had grabbed land that never belonged to China. This is really a big joke. The military intelligence office was established ten years (in 1732) after Yungcheng, son of K'anghsi, succeeded to the throne. During the reign of K'anghsi, there was no such military organ. How could anyone produce a report by a non-existent organ? According to the book "A Trip to the North," the afore-mentioned sentence cited by the Soviet revisionists derives from the January 23, 1690 (December 14 of the 28th year of the K'anghsi reign) report by the political counselor-regent of the Ch'ing Dynasty. This allegation is also contrary to the fact. The full text of the afore-mentioned report by the political counselor-regent is contained in the "Factual Record of K'anghsi" which was compiled by the government of the Ch'ing Dynasty on the basis of its original archives in 1731. The alleged sentence does not appear in it. On the contrary, this report begins with the following statement: "The Rakshas (meaning the Tsarist Russian aggressors) who secretly occupied the Yaksa and other areas have harrassed our hunters and forest rangers for more than 30 years." This clearly points out Tsarist Russia's barbarous aggression against the territory of China. The book "A Trip to the North" quoted by the Soviet revisionists also emphatically points out: "Russia trespassed on our boundary, occupied Nipchu, Yaksa and other areas stealthily, and harassed and killed the nearby residents." The book adds: "The city of Nipchu, originally Chinese territory, was ceded to Russia in the 28th

year of the K'anghsi reign when the boundary was demarcated." The book contains no less than 20 similar records. The Soviet revisionists deliberately ignore the mass of historical data contained in the report by the political counselor-regent contained in the "Factual Record of K'anghsi" and in the book "A Trip to the North." Instead, they obstinately cling to one single sentence which is inconsistent with the fact and which does not appear in the report by the political counselor-regent. This is an attempt to rewrite history. But their deliberate effort to deny at one stroke the fact that the Heilung and Wusuli Rivers have belonged to China since ancient times will only prove futile.

Also noteworthy is the fact that the Soviet revisionists also describe the 1727 "Burinsky Treaty," which definedthe middle sector of the Sino-Russian boundary, as "unequal," alleging that through this treaty, Manchu China "again grabbed a portion of land from Russia." The fact is just the opposite. Tsarist Russia used bribes to buy off officials of the Ch'ing Dynasty*, and through this treaty made enormous territorial gains for itself. At that time special envoy Sava who concluded and signed this treaty, in his report to Catherine I, Empress of Russia, admitted that through this treaty, Tsarist Russia obtained land that never before was owned by Russians.** His aides also said frankly: "This newly defined boundary is highly favorable to Russia. Russia has actually extended its territory miles into Mongolia that takes several days or in some sections even weeks to cover."***

The "Burinsky Treaty" provides that the middle sector of the Sino-Russian boundary runs from Shapintapahar to the Argun River, the larger part of which now has become the boundary between the People's Republic of Mongolia and the Soviet Union. Let us ask: Since you have so vigorously claimed that the "Burinsky Treaty" resulted in the loss of "part of Tsarist Russia's territory," do you intend some day to recover the "lost territory" from the People's Republic of Mongolia?

## III. Before Tsarist Russia's Intrusion, China's Original Western Boundary Ran Through the Balkhash Lake

The Soviet revisionists also make the same vigorous effort to distort history with regard to the western sector of the Sino-Russian boundary. They openly allege that never before had the areas east and south of the Balkhash Lake which were ceded to Tsarist Russia during

---

* Karen, "History of Sino-Russian Negotiations in Early Ch'ing Period," 1912 Paris edition, Appendix 63.

** Ibid., p. 219.

*** Baplovsky, "Sino-Russian Relations," 1949 New York edition, p. 29.

the late 19th century "actually been under China's jurisdiction." They even go so far as to say that these areas "had never belonged to the Ch'ing empire."

As everyone knows, as far back as 60 B.C., during the period of the Han Dynasty, China set up the western frontier agency to exercise sovereignty on behalf of the Central Government over the vast areas including the Ili River basin. Among these areas under the jurisdiction of the western frontier agency were Wusun and Tawan south of the Balkhash Lake and Wulei in the Pamir area. Local leaders of all nationalities there ranging from dukes to mayors were presented with seals of the Han government, which stationed troops and developed farms in the Wusunchih valley (now an area on the southeast bank of the Soviet Issyk-Kul) and other areas.*

During the 7th century, or the period of the T'ang Dynasty, China set up the office of the Anhsi Governor General. Later, this was reinforced by the establishment of the office of the Peit'ing Governor General. Under these two offices were the governors of Mengch'ih, K'unling and other regions, many commissioners, and chou and county governments. Under their jurisdiction were vast areas in China's western frontier including the Balkhash Lake, the Ch'u River basin and Pamir. Suiyeh in the Ch'u River basin was one of the four famous cities of Anhsi during the T'ang Dynasty. In Pamir and areas north of it, the T'ang Dynasty established the Niaofei, Chihpa and other chou governments. The T'ang Dynasty also maintained a large number of troops on the western frontier. These troops included the "Yupao army stationed at the city of Suiyeh."** A military organ called the "Onion Range Defenders" was also established by the T'ang Dynasty on the Pamir plateau.***

By the middle of the 18th century, the western frontier was renamed Sinkiang by the government of the Ch'ing Dynasty, which established an executive organ headed by General Ili in charge of military and political affairs in areas including the upper reaches of the Artysh River, and in the region extending from the Balkhash Lake to Pamir. Many Kalun (outposts) were established by the government of the Ch'ing Dynasty in these areas in order to carry out a strict patrol system. Officers and men were regularly sent on inspection missions by the outposts to patrol the Ch'u River, the Talas River, the Issyk-Kul and the Balkhash Lake. Russian representative Babkov, who signed the "Protocol on the Delimitation of the Sino-Russian Northwest Boundary,"

---

* "Book of Han," Vols. 69, 96.

** "The Later T'ang History," Vol. 40.

*** Ibid.

frankly admitted that "the routes patrolled by these officers and men make up a special line covering the Chiho border area and the eastern part of the outer Ili region (located in east and south of the Balkhash Lake in today's Kazakh and Kirgiz of the Soviet Union).* The Ch'ing Dynasty also developed farms in the area east and south of the Balkhash Lake, and established a "seed cultivation center" in the upper reaches of the Ch'u River.** The Ch'ing government allowed nomads of Kazakh and Burud nationalities willing to be assimilated with China to enter these areas for hunting and livestock breeding. Every year "one out of every 100 head of cattle and horses and one out of every 1,000 sheep" raised by them would be delivered to the Ch'ing government as tax in kind.*** These are historical facts that can hardly be denied by anyone. Even the "Encyclopedia" published by imperialist Russia unequivocally acknowledged the Balkhash lake as China's original western boundary.+

The Soviet revisionists also allege that Dzungaria of the Olute Mongolian nationality who lived in western China during the early Ch'ing Dynasty was a sovereign state independent of China. They describe the unification of Sinkiang by the Central Government of the Ch'ing Dynasty in the middle of the 18th century in these terms: "China conquerors of Manchu" "conquered" Dzungaria and opened up a "new frontier." This is the height of absurdity.

Olute is a tribe of our Mongolian nationality. In the early 15th century, the Ming Dynasty bestowed the titles of Shunning King, Hsien-i King and Anlo King on the leaders of Olute Mongolia (called Wals at the time).++ The aides of the Wals leaders were appointed to various official posts such as Tu-chih-hui-shih, Tu-chih-hui-chien-shih, Chih-hui, Ch'ien-hu and Chen-fu. In the middle of the 17th century, the Ming Dynasty was superseded by the Ch'ing Dynasty, and Olute Mongolia then paid tribute to the latter. In 1677 Ko-erh-tan, leader of the Dzungaria tribe of Olute Mongolia, styled himself as a Khan and exercised sovereign power. Since then, the succeeding leaders of Dzungaria sometimes submitted to and sometimes rebelled against the

---

* Babkov, "Recollections of My Service in Western Siberia, 1859-1875," 1912 Petersburg edition, p. 164

** Ho Ying, "Collection of Documents on Three Chous," Vol. 8.

*** Ch'un Yüan, "Records of Visits to the Western Frontier," Vol. 1, p. 10.

\+ "Encyclopedia" of Imperial Russia, 1903 Petersburg edition, Vol. 76, p. 805.

++ "Factual Records of the Ming Dynasty," Vol. 64, p. 6.

Ch'ing Dynasty government, continually carrying out activities to split the motherland. In 1755 the Ch'ing Dynasty suppressed the Dzungarian rebellion. This was China's internal problem, which was entirely different from the conquest of one country by another.

As a matter of fact, it was Tsarist Russia that wildly attempted to conquer our Dzungarian tribe and annex our northwest territory at that time. In 1714, Peter I sent an aggressive army with Lieutenant-Colonel Bhoglez as the leader in a vain attempt to invade and take over the vast land in our Sinkiang from the upper reaches of the Artysh River to Yeh-erh-chiang. Later, on many occasions, he sent envoys to Sinkiang with the attempt to cajole and force the Dzungarian tribe to submit to Russia. The reunification of China's northwestern region represented a heavy blow to the highly ambitious Tsarist Russian aggressors. The Soviet revisionists have kept silent about the naked aggressive acts of Tsarist Russia, but made a lot of noise about the unification of China's northwest areas by the Ch'ing Dynasty. They have with an ulterior motive referred to Sinkiang as another "country." Viewed together with a series of their subversions against Sinkiang, this more clearly shows that like Tsarist Russia, Soviet revisionist social-imperialism harbors aggressive ambitions toward China's Sinkiang region.

## IV. All Treaties Concerning the Current Sino-Soviet Border Are Unequal Treaties Imposed on China by Tsarist Russia

Feudal emperors in Chinese history had committed aggression against their neighboring countries, but so far as Sino-Russian relations are concerned, it was Tsarist Russia that committed aggression against China, and not China that committed aggression against Tsarist Russia. After the Opium War of 1840, China was gradually reduced to a semi-colony and was subjected to barbaric aggression by big powers. From the mid-19th century to the early 20th century, Tsarist Russia, colluding with Western big powers, resorted to such means as armed aggression and diplomatic blackmail to force the government of the Ch'ing Dynasty to sign a series of unequal treaties, including the "Treaty of Aigun," the "Treaty of Peking," the "Protocol on the Delimitation of the Northwest Sector of the Sino-Russian Boundary" and the "Treaty of Ili," and annexed more than 1.5 million square kilometers of Chinese territory. Among the imperialist powers, Tsarist Russia grabbed more Chinese territory than the others. Today, to suit the needs of their aggressive and expansionist policy, the Soviet revisionists are trying in every possible way to deny that such treaties are unequal treaties imposed on China by Tsarist Russia. They flagrantly declare that the "significance" of these treaties lies in the fact that Russia "did not resort to armed force." In saying so, they attempt to cover up the fact that Tsarist Russia annexed large tracts of Chinese territory and to clear the criminal responsibility of Tsarist Russia. They are shameless to the extreme.

The "Treaty of Aigun" of 1858 was the first unequal treaty Tsarist Russia imposed on China by force.

Since the forties of the 19th century, Tsarist Russia had flagrantly violated the "Treaty of Nipchu" [Nerchinsk] and time and again intruded into the lower reaches of the Heilung River and Kuyeh Island [Sakhalin]. It wilfully and forcibly set up sentry posts at Miao-chieh (now called Nikolayevsk in the Soviet Union) and Kuotuntun (now called Malinsk in the Soviet Union). Despite repeated protests by the government of the Ch'ing Dynasty, Tsarist Russia sent large numbers of vessels with a large number of aggressor forces to intrude into the Heilung River four times from 1854 to 1857, and unilaterally set up many military "settlements" on the northern bank of the Heilung River in its upper and middle and areas in its lower reaches. In May 1858, taking advantage of the situation in which the Anglo-French aggressor forces were attacking Tientsin and the border defense in China's northeast was weak, Russian viceroy Nicholas Muraviev in eastern Siberia, resorting to forcible occupation, led armed vessels to Aigun and forced a general of the Ch'ing Dynasty in Heilungkiang to sign a treaty unilaterally drafted by Tsarist Russia, declaring: "The words 'with the river (Heilungkiang) as the boundary' must not be changed."* Moreover, he clamored that if China did not accept the treaty, Russia would join forces with Britain to fight against China.** At the same time, the Russian side openly made a show of force by firing their rifles and cannon. Under the threat of Russian guns, officials of the Ch'ing Dynasty were finally forced to sign the "Treaty of Aigun" on May 28, 1858, under which more than 600,000 square kilometers of Chinese land north of the Heilung River were ceded to Tsarist Russia. The treaty only provided that 64 farming villages east of the river were to be "populated forever" by the Chinese people and administered by Chinese officials, "not to be invaded" by Russians, and that areas east of the Wusuli River were to be jointly administered by China and Russia.

In 1858, commenting on the "Treaty of Aigun," Marx pointed out: "The Second Opium War helped Russia seize the most fertile region between the Tatar Strait and Lake Baykal." ("Sino-British Treaty") In the same year, Engels also pointed out: Russia "seized from China as large a tract of land as the combined territories of France and Germany and a river as long as the Danube." ("Russia's Successes in the Far East") With regard to the fact that Tsarist Russia had forcibly occupied Chinese territory by means of the "Treaty of Aigun,"

---

* "History of Foreign Affairs," Hsienfeng period of the Ch'ing Dynasty, Vol. 25.

** Grachev, "The Annexation of Heilungkiang Border Region into Russia," the 1920 edition of the South Ussuri Branch of the Russian Geography Association, p. 14.

Niverskoi, a Russian vanguard in the invasion of Heilungkiang, frankly admitted that this treaty "enabled Russia to obtain more than 500,000 square Russian miles...."* In his report to the Tsar, Koerchakov, the then Russian foreign minister, also said with joy that this treaty "has added large tracts of territory to Russia."** The 1926 edition of the "Encyclopedia of the Soviet Union" also pointed out: The "Treaty of Aigun" "was the first firm step taken by Imperial Russia in forcibly occupying Chinese territory."

No sophistry can ever change the unequal character of the Sino-Russian "Treaty of Aigun." But the Soviet revisionists now allege that "the Treaty of Aigun did not contain any unequal clauses" and that "this treaty did not do China any damage." They also claim that "the Treaty of Aigun was aimed at coping with incursion by West European powers into the Heilungkiang region," and "had promoted the consolidation of Sino-Russian relations." Under the pen of the Soviet revisionists, the "Treaty of Aigun," which was imposed on China by force and under which large tracts of Chinese territory were ceded to Tsarist Russia, becomes an equal treaty of friendship and mutual assistance, and the Tsars who were aggressive in nature become benefactors helping semi-colonial China resist foreign aggression. This is strange news indeed! What is more, they shamelessly claim that the stipulation in the "Treaty of Aigun" that the Chinese government would continue to maintain jurisdiction over Chinese residents in the 64 villages east of the Heilung River was "unequal as far as Russia was concerned." As a matter of fact, the 64 villages east of the river were Chinese territory, and the local residents were Chinese people who had lived there for generations. By means of the "Treaty of Aigun," Tsarist Russia grabbed more than 600,000 square kilometers of Chinese territory and left China only this little right. But now the Soviet revisionists flagrantly allege that this was "unequal" to Tsarist Russia. What gangster logic!

In 1860, taking advantage of the situation in which the Anglo-French joint forces were attacking Peking, Tsarist Russia once again forced the Ch'ing government to sign the "Treaty of Peking" -- a new treaty under which more Chinese territory was ceded to Tsarist Russia.

At that time, on the one hand Tsarist Russia used force to compel the Chinese people to move out of areas east of the Wusuli River, "ordering all Chinese officials and sentry posts to be removed

---

* Niverskoi, "The Merits of Russian Naval Officers in the Russian Far East," 1947 Moscow edition, p. 357.

** Popov, "Tsarist Russia's Diplomacy During the T'aip'ing Heavenly Kingdom Period," carried in the Soviet "Red Archives" journal, 1927, Vol. 21, p. 197.

from the right (eastern) bank of the Wusuli to the left bank."* At the same time, Tsarist Russia sent Ignatiev as envoy to China to make the demand that the area east of the Wusuli River be ceded to Russia. After his arrival in China, Ignatiev colluded closely with the Anglo-French joint forces. When the joint forces advanced north from Tientsin, Ignatiev secretly passed to them important information about the movements of the Ch'ing army, and instigated them to "enter T'ungchou as soon as possible." On the eve of their attack on Peking, Ignatiev studied the plan for attacking the city together with them. At that time, a British army officer, Olaf, wrote with satisfaction: "General Ignatiev, Russian envoy to China, is now in our camp. He lends us the best Peking map I have ever seen. This map is better and more detailed than ours. He provides us with all the information he knows about Peking."** After the Ango-French joint forces took Peking, he again assisted the British and French aggressors in forcing China to sign the humiliating Sino-British and Sino-French "Treaties of Peking." As soon as the Ango-French forces withdrew from Peking, Ignatiev, using the "merit" he had won as "mediator" as the pretext, ferociously asked the Ch'ing government for a large tract of territory as a "reward." He said threateningly that if his demand were not accepted, he would call the joint forces back to Peking. He yelled that "Russia can easily deal an irresistible blow to you anywhere in your country."*** Thus, in November 1860, the Ch'ing government, under the threat of armed force, was forced to sign the Sino-Russian "Treaty of Peking." Following this, approximately 400,000 square kilometers of Chinese territory east of the Wusuli river were annexed by Tsarist Russia.

In the "Treaty of Peking," Tsarist Russia also forcibly fixed the western section of the Sino-Russian boundary and regarded permanent checkpoints set up by the Ch'ing Dynasty near townships within Chinese territory as demarcation points. It arbitrarily called the then Chinese inland lakes of Chaisang and Te-mu-erh-tu-Nao-erh (now called Issik Lake in the Soviet Union) boundary lakes. After sending troops to forcibly occupy large tracts of territory, Tsarist Russia on October 7, 1864 forced the Ch'ing government to sign the "Protocol on the Delimitation of the Sino-Russian Northwest Boundary" by citing the above clause of the "Treaty of Peking," even treating the Issik Lake, which the "Treaty of Peking" regarded as a boundary lake, as an inland lake of Tsarist Russia. Zhalov, chief Russian delegate

---

* Bukskevton, "The Treaty of Peking of 1860," 1902 Dairen edition, p. 31.

** Olaf, "The 1860 War Against China," 1901 London edition, p. 54.

*** Bukskevston, "The Treaty of Peking of 1860," p. 205.

signing the "Protocol," frankly admitted: This "is a beneficial protocol, under which large tracts of territory were transferred from China to Russia."* By means of the "Treaty of Peking" and the above "Protocol," Tsarist Russia seized more than 440,000 square kilometers of territory from China in the west.

On the character of the "Treaty of Peking," both the 1950 edition (edited by Vishinsky) and the 1961 edition (edited by Gromyko) of the "Diplomatic Dictionary" unequivocally admitted that the Sino-Russian, Sino-British and Sino-French "Treaties of Peking" were a series of unequal treaties imposed on China as a result of the 1859-1860 war between Britain and France on the one hand and China on the other. But now the Soviet revisionists reject the viewpoint affirmed by two Soviet foreign ministers, and allege that the Sino-Russian "Treaty of Peking" "was not the result of war or a show of force" and "cannot be considered unequal." By contradicting themselves, they can only show that they have politically degenerated to the extreme.

The Soviet revisionists arbitrarily argue that the direction of the western Sino-Russian boundary stipulated in the "Treaty of Peking" "reflected the actual conditions of the time" and is indisputable. According to their logic, whatever places were forcibly occupied by Tsarist Russia should belong to it. This theory of "reflecting the actual conditions" is out-and-out imperialist gangster logic. The Tsarist Russian aggressive element Muraviev said openly: "It is necessary to use actual occupation to support Russian diplomatic demands."** This is precisely what the Tsarist Russian aggressors did on the question of the Sino-Russian boundary. They always first carried out armed occupation to make it an accomplished fact, and then forced China to sign unequal treaties to "legalize" its bloody seizure of Chinese territory. At present, are the Soviet revisionists not attempting to act according to the theory of "reflecting the actual conditions" on the question of the Sino-Soviet boundary?

The Sino-Russian "Treaty of Ili" was another unequal treaty which Tsarist Russia forced on the Ch'ing government. In 1871, taking advantage of the incursion into Sinkiang by the Khokan chieftain Akupo, a running dog of British imperialism, Tsarist Russia sent troops to occupy the Ili region. The Ch'ing government made repeated representations to the Russian side on the return of the region, but without avail. In 1880, the Ch'ing government sent Tseng Chi-tse to Russia to reopen the negotiations. On the one hand, Tsarist Russia amassed tens of thousands of ground troops in Ili and sent more gunboats to stage a show

---

* "Collection of Articles on China, Eastern Siberia and Korea," Chapter 13: "Memoirs of E.E. Zhahalov."

** Babkov, "Recollections of My Service in Western Siberia, 1859-1875," 1912 Petersburg edition, p. 250.

of force along the Chinese coast; on the other, it wantonly blackmailed Tseng Chi-tse by threatening to stop the negotiations and declaring war on China. As early historical works published in the Soviet Union said, the result was that "China was forced to make concessions under the threat of imminent Russian military operations."* On February 24, 1881, the Sino-Russian "Treaty of Ili" was signed, under which, although Ili was returned to China, areas west of the Huoerhkuoszu River and east of the Chaisang lake were forcibly ceded to Russia. Thereafter, according to the provisions of that treaty, the Ch'ing government was once again forced to sign a series of protocols on the delimitation of the Sino-Russian boundary. By means of the "Treaty of Ili" and these protocols, Tsarist Russia annexed more than 70,000 square kilometers of Chinese territory. The Soviet revisionists, vainly attempted to change the fact that the "Treaty of Ili" was forced on China by Tsarist Russia, talk such nonsense as that this treaty "peacefully settled" the issue of the western section of the Sino-Russian border. They also say that only "a small piece of land remained under Russian jurisdiction" according to the "Treaty of Ili." Thus they lightly describe the tens of thousands of square kilometers of Chinese land under their occupation as "a small piece." What a big stomach they have. It must be pointed out that when a country occupies another country's land, even if it is only a square inch, it is aggression. But the "small piece" described by the Soviet revisionists is twice as big as the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic.

## V. The New and the Old Tsars Are Jackals of the Same Lair

In the second half of the 19th century, Russian capitalism developed rapidly, gradually passing into the stage of imperialism. During this period, Tsarist Russia conducted frenzied aggression and expansion against China. In collaboration with the Western powers, it pushed China step by step into the miserable abyss of being a semi-colony. But the Soviet revisionists say: not until "the late 19th century and early 20th century" did the China policy of the Tsarist government "assume the same character as the colonial policies adopted by the various European capitalist powers, Japan and the United States toward China." Prior to this period, Tsarist Russia, unlike the Western powers, did not carry out aggression against China and was not a country committed to foreign aggression and expansion. By sparing no effort to defend the aggression conducted by the old Tsars, the Soviet revisionists have no sense of shame at all.

Anybody with a little knowledge of history knows that Tsarist Russia actively carried out expansion abroad since the second half of the 16th century. Many countries and nations in the world had suffered

---

* Savin, "Mutual Relations between Tsarist Russia, Soviet Union and China," 1930 Moscow-Leningrad edition, p. 52.

from its plunder, and China was only one of them. According to data quoted by Lenin in "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," by 1876, colonies seized by Tsarist Russia measured 17 million square kilometers, more than three times as large as its own territory.

The works of Marx, Engels and Lenin fully exposed Tsarist Russia's expansionist activities which lasted several centuries. In 1853, Marx verified "many facts about seizure of others' land by Russia since Peter the Great." He pointed out: "The land gained by Russia from Sweden is larger than the remaining territory of the Swedish kingdom. The land it seized from Poland is equal in size to the entire Austrian empire. The land it gained from the European portion of Turkey exceeds the size of Prussia (less the territories in the Rhine valley). The land it gained from the Asian portion of Turkey is as large as the entire German land. The land it gained from Persia is no less than the territory of one Britain. From Tatar, Russia seized land equivalent to the combined size of European Turkey, Greece, Italy and Spain." (The Turkish Question," The Times--The Russian Expansion) During the same period, Engels also pointed out: "Russia is no doubt a country with aggressive ambition." ("The Real Contention for Turkey") "In every war of the past 150 years, this empire has nver lost any land but has always gained territory." ("The Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany") Lenin later pointed out: "For many centuries, the Tsarist government had always attempted to seize Constantinople and the major part of Asia. It consistently pursued such a policy and took advantage of the contradictions and conflicts among the major powers to attain this goal." ("On Unilaterally Seeking Peace") He also emphasized: "It has been several decades since Russia pursued a policy of plunder against China, Persia, Albania and Galicia." ("Speech at the International Mass Rally in Berne") These brilliant observations by Marx, Engels and Lenin completely refute the lies fabricated by the Soviet revisionists that the old Tsars did not pursue a colonial policy until the late 19th century and the early 20th century.

The Soviet revisionists, betraying Marxism-Leninism, have made every endeavor to whitewash the aggressive crimes committed by Tsarist Russia. Their aim is to offer a plausible explanation for the Soviet revisionist new Tsars' wholesale inheritance of the old Tsars' mantle, to use it to serve their social-imperialist policy of expansion, and to create a historical basis for their aggression against China.

It is noteworthy that the Soviet revisionists so wilfully distort the clear provision of the "Treaty of Nipchu" specifying that there would be no delineation of boundary lines in the Wuti River area for the time being as to clamor wildly that the "whole northeastern part of Manchuria" today is an undemarcated region. They also claim that through the "Treaty of Nipchu," China "occupied" a large tract of Russian territory "along the Heilung River," and that the "Treaty of Aigun" and the "Treaty of Peking" had only enabled Tsarist Russia to "partially recover" "territories seized from Russia" during the Ch'ing Dynasty. In other words, the Soviet revisionsts are not satisfied with the old Tsars'

occupation of the more than one million square kilometers of Chinese land north of the Heilung River and east of the Wusuli River. They also want to stretch their hands into the huge tract of land south of the Heilung River which the old Tsars had no time to occupy. In Western China, the Soviet revisionists are not content with the old Tsars' occupation of the huge Pamir area west of the Sarykol Range--an area which belonged to China--in violation of the boundary treaty reached in 1884 by China and Russia. They also claim that the Tash Kurghan area in China's Sinkiang east of Pamir, which the old Tsars were unable to occupy, once belonged to Khokan (a khanate in Central Asia annexed by Tsarist Russia in 1876), and that Russia had the right to take it over. This means that the Soviet revisionists today have the right of inheriting this place. Are not the Soviet revisionists' ambitions and their appetite for Chinese territory only too obvious? This shows not only that the new Tsars of Soviet revisionism and the old Tsars are jackals of the same lair, but also that the new Tsars are even more ambitious in aggression.

Through unequal treaties, the old Tsars not only annexed large tracts of Chinese territory and extorted huge indemnities, but also claimed many special rights from China. Through the "Treaty of Tientsin" and the "Treaty of Peking," predatory treaties signed in the middle of the 19th century, Tsarist Russia gained consular judicial rights, the right to trade by land routes, the right to carry on trade and station warships in commercial ports, the right to send missionaries inland, inland water navigation rights, the right to participate in fixing tariff rates, the right to be treated as the most favored nation, and other privileges of aggressive nature. Vynukov, a Tsarist Russian aggressor, once said: "The 'Sino-Russian Treaty of Tientsin' can be considered the foundation of all subsequent great diplomatic achievements by our country." "Article 12, that is, the last article, alone has enabled us to enjoy all the political, commercial and other rights and privileges which China can give to foreigners."* These Sino-Russian treaties had all the features of unequal treaties imposed by Western powers on China in the same period. They further reduced China to the status of a semi-colony and brought about grave disasters to the Chinese people of all nationalities. From this, we can see that there is no essential difference but complete identity between the Tsarist government's China policy and the policies of the Western powers. If one insists that there is some difference, the difference is that Tsarist Russia had the greatest ambitions with regard to Chinese territory, that through unequal treaties it annexed more Chinese territory, and that the areas it annexed far exceeded the combined total of those annexed by Western powers.

Lenin had from the outset favored the abolition of all unequal treaties imposed on China by Tsarist Russia. The Soviet government under Lenin had issued two declarations on China, stating solemnly: "All

---

* Vynukov, "Travel Notes on Russia's Asian Border Areas," 1868 St. Petersburg edition, pp. 325-326.

treaties concluded between the previous Russian governments and China are null and void, and all territores previously taken from China are to be given up." Here "all treaties" and "all territories" were specifically mentioned, but now the Soviet revisionists openly betray Lenin's behest, saying not only that these treaties are not among those to be abolished, but also that "adjustment" of these treaties has "consolidated" Sino-Russian relations, thereby setting the "general principle governing the relations between the two countries." We cannot but ask: Do you mean to use this "general principle" of national oppression to "adjust" and "consolidate" the present Sino-Soviet relations?

## VI. The Correct Path for the Peaceful Solution of the Sino-Soviet Border Question

The Sino-Soviet border question was caused by the aggression against China by Tsarist Russian imperialism. When the Soviet Union was still a socialist country, there was peace and quiet along the border, although the Sino-Soviet border question had not been settled. After betraying Marxism-Leninism, the Khrushchev renegade clique restored capitalism at home and pursued a policy of aggression and expansionism abroad. It frantically opposed the Chinese Communist Party which firmly upholds Marxism-Leninism, and extended the ideological differences between the two parties to state relations, incessantly stirring up border conflicts, with the result that the Sino-Soviet border question became an important issue of relations between the two countries.

The Chinese government has always advocated that the Sino-Soviet border question should be settled on the basis of the principles of equal consultation, mutual understanding and mutual accommodation and through peaceful negotiations, and has opposed the appeal to force. This was the stand the Chinese government delegation took in holding talks with the Soviet government delegation in 1964, when China took the initiative to propose border talks. However, because of the chauvinistic and expansionist stand persistently taken by the Soviet side, the talks broke down. Later on, the Soviet revisionists greatly increased their armed forces along the Sino-Soviet border, dispatched troops to be stationed in Mongolia, further disturbed the border status quo, and carried out armed provocations, culminating in the armed invasions of the Chinese territories of Chenpao Island and Tiehliehkoti resulting in serious incidents of bloodshed. And Sino-Soviet relations became more strained than ever.

In September 1969, when both the Chinese and the Soviet premiers met in Peking, the Chinese side proposed that the Sino-Soviet controversy on matters of principle should not hinder the normalization of relations between the two countries on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence. It proposed that the Sino-Soviet boundary question should be settled peacefully through negotiations free from any threat, and that to this end, both sides should sign a written agreement as a temporary measure to maintain the border status quo, avert armed clashes, and

withdraw the armed forces of both parties from the disputed areas before holding discussions on the delineation of boundary lines, the settlement of the border question, and concluding a new border treaty. At that time, the Soviet side expressed full concurrence. The two premiers then held talks on the basic content of such a temporary agreement and reached unanimity of views. On October 20, the Sino-Soviet border talks began in Peking. Before the talks, on October 8, the Chinese Foreign Ministry re-affirmed the consistent views of the Chinese government concerning overall settlement of the Sino-Soviet border question. These views are:

1. Distinguish between the right and wrong in history, and confirm that the existing treaties relating to the Sino-Soviet border are unequal treaties imposed on China by Tsarist Russian imperialism in the latter half of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century under conditions when the people of the two countries, China and Russia, had no right whatever.

2. In consideration of actual conditions, these treaties be taken as the basis for an overall settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question through peaceful negotiations and for determining the entire alignment of the boundary line. China does not demand the return of the Chinese territory which Tsarist Russia annexed by mean of these treaties.

3. Any side which occupies the territory of the other side in violation of these treaties must in principle return it unconditionally to the other side, but necessary adjustments may be made by both sides to these areas on the border in accordance with the principles of equal consultation, mutual understanding and mutual accommodation and in consideration of the interests of local inhabitants.

4. Conclude a new equal Sino-Soviet treaty to replace the old unequal Sino-Russian treaties and carry out a boundary survey and erect boundary markers.

5. Pending an overall settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question through peaceful negotiations, maintain the border status quo, avert armed clashes and disengage the armed forces of the Chinese and Soviet sides by withdrawing them from, or refraining from sending them into, all the disputed areas along the Sino-Soviet border, that is, those areas where the two sides disagreed in their delineations of the boundary line on the maps exchanged during the 1964 Sino-Soviet border negotiations.

Our government's five-point stand is the correct path for the peaceful settlement of the Sino-Soviet border question. Any unbiased person can see that these views showed China's utmost sincerity in achieving a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question. If the Soviet side has the same desire, there should be no reason why the Sino-Soviet boundary question cannot be settled at an early date.

However, nothing has come from the Sino-Soviet boundary talks in progress for five years. Why? Because the Soviet side did not mean what it said and betrayed the understanding reached by the two premiers. It refused from the outset to sign an agreement to maintain the border status quo, avert armed clashes, and disengage the armed forces of both sides from disputed areas. Thus, up to now, it has not been possible to begin negotiations free from any threat on the delineation of boundary lines. The Soviet side has even denied that there is a territorial question between the Soviet Union and China, and refused to recognize the objective fact that there are disputed areas along the Sino-Soviet border. It flagrantly declared that all disputed areas are Soviet territory, that the boundary line proposed by the Soviet Union was law which must be abided by by China, and that to maintain the border status quo was to maintain the boundary line they proposed. This in fact means refusal to negotiate or forcing China to agree that all Chinese territories either physically occupied or detached from China's map by the old and new Tsars in violation of unequal treaties belong to the Soviet Union. It is precisely because the Soviet revisionists stubbornly persist in their perfidious, and expansionist stand that the Sino-Soviet border talks have reached the present deadlock.

Such is the truth concerning the present Sino-Soviet border negotiations.

However, driven by the needs of its domestic and foreign policies, Soviet revisionist social-imperialism has set its propaganda machine in full motion, confusing black and white and fabricating rumors and slanders. It has tried its best to dress itself up as the standard bearer in improving Sino-Soviet relations and keen on holding talks to settle the border question, and to shift onto China the entire responsibility for undermining the relations between the two countries and the present negotiations. All these efforts are futile. History cannot be forged, nor can reality be distorted. The matter is very simple. If Soviet revisionism is sincere in wanting to improve Sino-Soviet relations and settle the boundary question, why does it not do several practical things? For instance, withdraw Soviet troops from Mongolia, reduce the Soviet armed forces in areas along the Sino-Soviet border to the level of the Khrushchev period, stop the military exercises and provocations along the Sino-Soviet border, cease sending spies into China, hold talks and sign an agreement for maintaining the border status quo on the basis of the understanding reached by the two premiers?

The Chinese people have all along hoped for an early settlement of the Sino-Soviet border question, and resolutely support the Chinese government's just stand concerning the settlement of the question. However, the Chinese people will not be deceived, nor will they bow to any threat. Times have changed. The history of the 19th century cannot repeat itself in China. If Soviet revisionist social-imperialism wants to pursue the same old dreams of the old Tsars in committing aggression against China, it will end up more ignominiously than the old Tsars!

* * *

END

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**
**National Technical Information Service**
Springfield, Va. 22161

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

**PRINTED MATTER**

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COM-211

U.S. MAIL

CMP X751231 001
UNIV ILLINOIS LIB AT CHICAGO CIRCLE
LIB SERIALS SEC
BOX 8198
CHICAGO IL 60680